

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CARINA CONERLY-- PETITIONER

VS.

SHARIF TARPIN -- RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF CALIFORNIA

---


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CARINA CONERLY

1501 AMAZON AVENUE

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95835

(916) 529-0812 or (916) 704-6755



## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. WHETHER, video cameras used in public are protected by The United States Constitution, especially when applying and exercising under the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment's Protected Rights of The United States Constitution?
2. WHETHER, when a California State Superior Court Family Law Judge can make an ORDER that a Party and Non-Parties to a Family Law Case must not videotape in a public parking lot, violates the Constitutional Rights of the Party and non-Parties, in the Court Case under the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution?
3. WHETHER, Appellate Court erred by its decision that dismissed Appellant's Case?
4. WHETHER, California Supreme Court Judge Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye erred and abused her discretion by denying Appellant's/Petitioner's Petition to review her Case?
5. WHETHER, Appellate Court Assistant Deputy Clerk III Ben Haskett erred in awarding "Respondent shall recover costs on appeal"?
6. WHETHER, Appellate Court Deputy Clerk David Welton erred in awarding "Respondent to recover costs on appeal"?
7. WHETHER, Acting P.J. Robie erred in dismissing Appellant's/Petitioner's two Appeals?
8. WHETHER, the Appellate Court (signed by Robie, Acting P.J.) erred in determining that the orders appealed by Appellant/Petitioner were non-appealable?
9. WHETHER, Petitioner's Constitutional 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights were violated when the Appellate Court finalized and erred by Assistant Deputy Clerk Ben Haskett

signed, instead of Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann, and by ordering that “Respondent shall recover costs on appeal” and thereby abused its discretion by issuing Defendant/ Appellant/ Petitioner an order to recover cost from Petitioner?

10. WHETHER, the Appellate Court Acting P.J. Robie erred and abused his/her discretion by determining and ordering that the Petitioner’s appeals were non-appealable?

11. WHETHER, Petitioner’s **Constitutional 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights** were violated when the Appellate Court finalized and erred by Deputy Clerk David Welton signed, instead of Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann, and by ordering that “Respondent shall recover costs on appeal” and thereby abused its discretion by issuing Defendant/ Appellant/ Petitioner an order to recover cost from Petitioner?

12. WHETHER, Petitioner’s **Constitutional 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights** were violated when the Trial Superior Court of California Family Law Judge John P. Winn made an ORDER that Petitioner/Party and Non-Parties to a Family Law Case must say specific words, phrases, and statements of the Judge’s choosing and the Judge’s specific chosen topics, or Petitioner could be criminally and or civilly charged?

13. WHETHER, Petitioner’s **Constitutional 9<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights** were violated when the Trial Superior Court of California Family Law Judge John P. Winn made an order restricting Petitioner from exercising her previously stated Constitutional Protected rights to videotape in a public parking lot?

14. WHETHER, Petitioner’s **Constitutional 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights to Due Process** were violated when the Trial Superior Court Judge John P. Winn treated Black

Petitioner Carina Conerly less favorably than Filipino Respondent Sharif Tarpin during Court Proceedings (e.g., when Judge Winn allowed Respondent Sharif Tarpin to file meritless Ex Parte hearing, when Judge Lauri Damrell allowed Respondent Sharif Tarpin to show up in Court over an hour late, when Judge James M. Mize continued a Domestic Violence Hearing to another date when Respondent Sharif Tarpin did not show up, when all the judges allowed Respondent Sharif Tarpin to proceed when he has not served Petitioner Carina Conerly, when clerks and judges would not allow Petitioner Carina Conerly to present all her evidence against Respondent Sharif Tarpin)?

### **LIST OF PARTIES**

- ☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- ☐ All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

### **RELATED CASES**

- Case No. 20-17029, D.C. No. 2:19-cv-01021-KJM-KJN James Conerly, Carina Conerly, Marilyn Tillman-Conerly, and M.T. v. Veracity Research Company, and Kristy Torain.
- Case No. 20-16679, D.C. No. 2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN Carina Conerly, and M. T. v. Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi, Uduak Inyang Oduok, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, Sharif Roldan Tarpin, and John Patrick Winn.
- Case No. 20-17118, D.C. No. 20:19-cv-01833-JAM-AC James Conerly, Carina Conerly, and Marilyn Tillman-Conerly v. John Patrick Winn, Sharif Roldan Tarpin and Kiana R Turner.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	3-13
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	14-15
CONCLUSION.....	15

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Supreme Court of California Decision of Petition of review Denied
APPENDIX B	Third Appellate District Court of The State of California Decision Non-Appealable Dismissal
APPENDIX C	Third Appellate District Court of The State of California Decision Dismissal of request for reconsideration
APPENDIX F	Supreme Court Of California <b>DOCKET (Register of Actions) CASE No. S265069</b> from Appellate Court Case Information online
APPENDIX G	California 3 <sup>rd</sup> Appellate District <b>DOCKET (Register of Actions) (C092174)</b> from Appellate Court Case Information online
APPENDIX H	Superior Court Of California, County of Sacramento <b>Docket List created by Carina Conerly CASE No. 19FL05538</b> William R. Ridgeway Family Relations

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

### STATUTES AND RULES

14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution .....	ii-iii
9 <sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution .....	ii
5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution .....	ii
4 <sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution .....	i-ii
1 <sup>st</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution .....	i

### OTHER

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_ ; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_ ; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state, California Supreme Court to review the merits appears at Appendix   **A**   to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_ ; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the Court of Appeal of the State of California, in and for The Third Appellate District to review the merits, appears at Appendix   **B**   to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_ ; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was November 24, 2020  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).



## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution

9<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution

5<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution

4<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution

1<sup>st</sup> Amendment of the United States of America Constitution

## **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

On **October 16, 2019** Sharif Tarpin filed a Request for Order and a Petition to Establish Parental Relationship in which he did not request Child Support. However, The Petition to Establish Parental Relationship on page 2 states the following: The court may make orders for support of the children and issue an earnings assignment without further notice to either party.

On **November 5, 2019** Carina Conerly Filed a Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order against Sharif Tarpin requesting Child Support and providing the needed FL-155, Financial Statement (Simplified).

On **November 6, 2019** the William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse filed DV-110 Temporary Restraining Order, granting restraining order for Carina Conerly and M.T. but in section 13 Child Support: Not Ordered now but may be ordered after a noticed hearing.

On **November 12, 2019** Sharif Tarpin was served by the Sheriff's Civil Bureau the Domestic Violence Restraining Order Paperwork and the Temporary Restraining Order.

On **November 13, 2019** Carina Conerly went and picked-up from the Sheriff's Civil Bureau, the paperwork for the Request for Order and a Petition to Establish Parental Relationship that Sharif Tarpin filed.

On **November 25, 2019** the Domestic Violence Restraining Order Case was heard by Joginder Dhillon who told Carina Conerly that the Child Custody and Child Support would be addressed during Mediation scheduled for November 26, 2019. He also ruled that the Court finds that there is not sufficient evidence to support the granting of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order, refusing to view harassing text messages sent to Carina Conerly from Sharif Tarpin, witnesses of Sharif Tarpin's drug abuse and destructive character, Sharif Tarpin's numerous traffic tickets and Sharif Tarpin's Misdemeanor Case, and vacated the orders of the temporary restraining order that was granted on November 6, 2019. William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse did not have a Court Reporter at the Domestic Violence Hearing.

On **November 26, 2019** Mediation took place but would not address Child Support. Carina Conerly was told the focus of Mediation was on Child Custody by the Mediator Nora Williams. Nora Williams also refused to see nor take into account any evidence Carina Conerly had against Sharif Tarpin including his Felony that Sharif Tarpin pled No Contest to, was reduced to a Misdemeanor, and then completely dismissed by the State of California, involving Sharif Tarpin carrying a concealed 40 Caliber Glock within his vehicle without a Concealed Weapons License or Permit. Carina Conerly was then scheduled for a Custody Hearing on December 17, 2019 at 9:00AM. On Carina Conerly's

Responsive Declaration to Request for Order filed on December 12, 2019, Carina Conerly again requested Child Support.

On **December 12, 2019** Carina Conerly filed her Order on Court Fee Waiver for the Superior Court at William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse.

On **December 17, 2019** the Child Custody case was heard by Lauri Damrell who provided Custody Orders and Visitation Orders and adopted the Mediator's recommendations granting all of Sharif Tarpin's requests. Lauri Damrell did not address Child Support Orders even after Carina Conerly requested. No Court Reporter was present. Instead, the case was set for Trial on February 14, 2020 at 8:30AM.

On **December 17, 2019** the United States District Court Eastern District of California issued a Summons in a Civil Case on Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB that lists Sharif Roldan Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, Joginder Dhillon, Lauri Damrell, Nora Williams, numerous California State Agencies, California Employees, and affiliates of the State of California as Defendants and Carina Conerly as one of the Plaintiffs.

On **December 19, 2019** Nora Williams, June D. Coleman, Lauri Damrell, Joginder Dhillon, and Superior Court of California County of Sacramento was served the Summons in a Civil Case and Complaint for Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB at the Office of the Attorney General for California.

On **December 20, 2019** Sharif Roldan Tarpin was served the Summons in a Civil Case and Complaint for Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB at his Western Dental job.

On **December 24, 2019** Carina Conerly received from the State of California Health and Human Services Agency, Child Support Representative, Melody Bayless that Sharif Tarpin has asked them to Open/Reopen a child support case for M.T. and to return the FL-155 form to them. However, Sharif Tarpin has never requested Child Support. Carina Conerly had already provided the FL-155 on this case with the Domestic Violence paperwork on November 5, 2019.

On **December 27, 2019** Nora Williams, June D. Coleman, Lauri Damrell, Joginder Dhillon, and Superior Court of California County of Sacramento was served a second time the Summons in a Civil Case and Complaint for Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB at the Judicial Council of California.

On **January 14, 2020** Carina Conerly called both Phillip Veres at (916) 875-7328 and Melody Bayless at (916) 876-1224 and left voicemail messages that she had already requested Child Support and provided the FL-155 on Case Number 19FL05538.

On **January 16, 2020** Carina Conerly received a Notice Regarding Payment of Support from Melody Bayless, stating that the local child support agency, Sacramento, is the substituted payee for the current child support, child support arrears, and medical support on Case Number: 19FL05538.

On **January 23, 2020** Carina Conerly received a Proof of Service for the Notice Regarding Payment of Support-Substitution of Payee from Sacramento County Department of Child Support Services.

On **January 29, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Request for Recusal at the Superior Court of California County of Sacramento with Deputy Clerk, C. Brown, and Joginder Dhillon Present telling Deputy Clerk, C. Brown, to file and endorse the Request for Recusal.

On **February 14, 2020** Bunmi Awoniyi denied the recusal and assigned the trial to Department 120, Judge John P. Winn.

On **February 14, 2020** the Custody Trial was heard by John P. Winn, in which again Carina Conerly asked for Child Support Orders and no Child Support Orders were given.

Carina Conerly also provided 298 pages of evidence including Exhibits A through MMMM, several videos of Sharif Tarpin's conduct, and three witnesses. On Exhibit A was the Request for Recusal filed in the Superior Court of California County of Sacramento on January 29, 2020 with Joginder Dhillon present at the filing counter with the Deputy Clerk C. Brown who endorsed the filing. On Exhibit B was the United States District Court Eastern District of California Summons in a Civil Case on Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB that lists Sharif Roldan Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, Joginder Dhillon, Lauri Damrell, Nora Williams, numerous California State Agencies, California Employees, and affiliates of the State of California as Defendants and Carina Conerly as one of the Plaintiffs. On Exhibit MMMM was the United States District Court Eastern District of California Clerks Certificate of Entry of Default for Sharif Roldan Tarpin on Case Number: 2:19-cv-02535-JAM-DB. John P. Winn gave a parenting plan for visitation and custody violating Carina Conerly's Constitutional Rights and favoring Sharif Tarpin's requests. William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse did not provide a Court Reporter for the Custody Trial.

On **February 18, 2020** the United States District Court Eastern District of California issued a Summons in a Civil Case for Case Number: 2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN that lists Sharif Roldan Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, John Patrick Winn, Uduak Inyang Oduok, and Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi as Defendants in the case and Carina Conerly as one of the Plaintiffs.

On **February 18, 2020** Sharif Roldan Tarpin was served the Summons in a Civil Case and Complaint for Case Number:2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN at the court ordered Exchange location of 1429 Broadway Sacramento, CA 95818.

On **February 19, 2020** Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi, Uduak Inyang Oduok, and John Patrick Winn were served Summons in a Civil Case and Complaint for Case Number:2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN at the Judicial Council of California.

On **March 17, 2020** Sharif Tarpin filed Request for Order for an Ex-Parte Hearing and no Child Support was requested by him.

On **March 24, 2020** Carina Conerly filed in the Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse Drop Box her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order to Sharif Tarpin's Request for Order and a Notice of Appeal because the William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse was closed due to the Coronavirus and a sign at the William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse said to go the Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse to file paperwork. However, Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse returned Carina Conerly's paperwork stating that it must be resubmitted to William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse, which was closed at the time.

On **March 30, 2020** the Ex-Parte Hearing for Sharif Tarpin was cancelled due to Coronavirus.

On **March 30, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Notice of Appeal to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Appellate District Court of Sacramento, California.

On **May 5, 2020** Carina Conerly received a Minute Order from John P. Winn at William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse that the Ex-Parte Hearing was continued to May 20, 2020 at 1:30PM.

On **May 11, 2020** Carina Conerly called the Sacramento County Child Support Department and informed them that she had not received any child support. Carina Conerly was informed that they were awaiting the Child Support Orders from William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse. Carina Conerly informed them that William R. Ridgeway never issued any Child Support Orders although she has repeatedly requested them and she wanted to know what will happen. the Sacramento County Child Support Department said they had to hear back from William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse to proceed.

On **May 12, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order with William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse requesting again Child Support Orders, requesting recusal of the judge, showing proof of Sharif Tarpin committing Perjury, and including in her exhibits the United States District Court Eastern District of California Summons in a Civil Case for Case Number:2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN that lists Sharif Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, John Patrick Winn, Uduak Inyang Oduok, and Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi as Defendants in the case.

On **May 13, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Request for Order including in her exhibits a Notice of Appeal and the United States District Court Eastern District of California Summons in a Civil Case for Case Number:2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN that lists Sharif Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, John Patrick Winn, Uduak Inyang Oduok, and Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi as Defendants in the case.

On **May 14, 2020** James M. Mize heard the Ex-Parte Application for Emergency Orders from Carina Conerly and it was denied. He told her to attend the Ex-Parte Hearing scheduled for May 20, 2020 with John P. Winn.

On **May 20, 2020** the Ex-Parte Hearing was heard by John P. Winn and Carina Conerly asked for Child Support Orders and again no Child Support was given by John P. Winn and no explanation as to why. Judge John P. Winn also modified the parenting plan for visitation and custody in favor of Sharif Tarpin. This time Carina Conerly requested that a Court Reporter be present at the Ex-Parte Hearing. Instead, the case was again referred to Family Court Services for Mediation and another hearing/trial was scheduled for August 4, 2020 at 9:00AM.

On **June 18, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Notice of Appeal and a Request for A Court Stamped Copy of Plaintiff's/Appellants' Notice of Appeal at William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse.

On **June 25, 2020** Superior Court of California County of Sacramento served Carina Conerly a Notice of Default for the June 18, 2020 Notice of Appeal filed and stated to submit a proper Notice of Appeal (parties are incorrect on the notice). It also stated that the Notice of Appeal was in Default for failure to file the sum of \$100 plus \$775.



However, there was already a fee waiver on file dated December 12, 2019 with the William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse.

On **June 30, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Notice of Appeal/Cross-Appeal for judgment entered on February 14, 2020. Another Court Fee Waiver was also filed at William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse for Carina Conerly.

On **July 10, 2020** Carina Conerly filed her Parenting Plan Questionnaire including her Notice of Appeal filed on June 30, 2020 and the United States District Court Eastern District of California Summons in a Civil Case for Case Number:2:20-cv-00362-KJM-KJN that lists Sharif Tarpin, Superior Court of California County of Sacramento, John Patrick Winn, Uduak Inyang Oduok, and Olubunmi Olaide Awoniyi as Defendants in the case.

On **July 13, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order for injuries on M.T. during her visitation time with Sharif Tarpin on July 11, 2020.

On **July 16, 2020** the Domestic Violence case was heard by James M. Mize and continued to August 25, 2020. Sharif Tarpin did not attend the hearing although, he was properly served.

On **July 16, 2020** Carina Conerly filed Appellant's Notice Designating Record on Appeal.

On **July 28, 2020** Carina Conerly attended a separate Zoom Mediation appointment with Mediator Marisela Bermudez who ignored all of Carina Conerly's evidence against Sharif Tarpin and agreed with all of Sharif Tarpin's requests.

On **August 3, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Motion for Peremptory Challenge and Order of Transfer with William R. Ridgeway Family Relations Courthouse.

On **August 4, 2020** Carina Conerly and Sharif Tarpin attended a Zoom Hearing with John P. Winn who continued the custody hearing to August 26, 2020 combining it with the Domestic Violence Hearing and vacating the August 25, 2020 hearing scheduled by James M. Mize on July 16, 2020.

On **August 7, 2020** John P. Winn denied the Peremptory Challenge.

On **August 10, 2020** Carina Conerly filed a Notice of Appeal.

On **August 11, 2020** Carina Conerly filed for a fee waiver.

On **August 17, 2020** Carina Conerly's fee waiver was granted.

On **August 21, 2020** the Third Appellate District Court of Appeal Dismissed the Appeal.

On **August 25, 2020** Carina Conerly filed her Appeal Reconsideration with the Third Appellate District Court of Appeal.

On **August 26, 2020** Carina Conerly and Sharif Tarpin attended a Zoom Hearing with John P. Winn who denied the recusal, denied the restraining order, and ordered another parenting plan for custody and visitation that again violated Carina Conerly's Constitutional Rights.

On **September 8, 2020** the Third Appellate District Court of Appeal **Denied** the Request for Reconsideration and **Dismissed the Appeal** filed on June 18 and Denied the Appeal filed on June 30, 2020.

On **October 19, 2020** Petitioner Carina Conerly filed her **Petition For review** in the California 3<sup>rd</sup> District Appellate Court.

On **October 23, 2020** Petitioner Carina Conerly filed a **change of her phone number**.

On **November 24, 2020** the California Supreme Court **Denied Appellant/Petitioner's Request for Review**.

On **June 3, 2021** NOW COMES Petitioner to respectfully submit and file for the United States Supreme Court to grant Petitioner's **PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Under Article III, Section II the United States Supreme Court establishes the jurisdiction (**legal ability to hear a case**) cases involving points of Constitutional and, or, Federal Law, such as the case at hand involves issues of Civil Rights Violation. Furthermore, that jurisdiction of this Court takes in Cases concerning State Courts violating well established laws governing **Constitutional Right to Due Process** controversy concerning equal rights within the Courts, right to litigate, Federal Lower Courts' Judges and staff differential treatment of Black Americans, even joining with the Non-Blacks in providing defense in favor of the Non-Black. This is done by such means of unjustly granting Non-Black Americans Dismissals of Black Americans Cases; unwarranted and wrongful jurisdictional rulings and orders that were done in the "best interest" of Respondent Sharif Tarpin, rather than minor M.T. (e.g., allowed respondent Sharif Tarpin to interrupt during hearings but the Judge would not let Petitioner finish her testimony The Judge was leading answers and statement (e. g. lead by Judge Winn after asking Respondent the question, court's staff assisted Respondent Sharif Tarpin with processing legal documents, Respondent Sharif personal stated the Judges and policemen were acting in his favor). These techniques are also very sophisticated, well financially funded, well planned, and etcetera, by the local government (federal and state, ).

Unfortunately, **SYSTEMIC RACISM** is a proper representation of these acts of the local government Judicial System upon **Black American Petitioner** Carina Conerly trying to get redress of wrongful injuries and damages brought by others, with the MAJOR ISSUE BEING THE VIOLATING DEFENDANT'S/APPELLANT'S/PETITIONER'S RIGHTS


TO JUSTICE AND EXERCISE HER CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.

Moreover, the covert tactics of hiring Africans into the Courts has been and still is a method the local judicial system that is used to continue to avoid hiring Black Americans. These covert and highly systemic techniques are but a few mentioned because they are growing more and more and looking from outside of these systems makes these acts not hard to discover, but victimized within, makes it hard to believe that outsiders do not see the corruption.

**CONCLUSION**

With respect giving to the United States Supreme Court, Court's Officers, Court's Staff and Others that are involved in handling of this case, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Carina Conerly

Date: June 3, 2021